

Applicant : Reiner Hammerich et al.
Serial No. : 10/760,135
Filed : January 16, 2004
Page : 6 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-193001 / 2001P00021 WOUS

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 19 2006REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were pending as of the action mailed on May 17, 2006.

Claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 16, and 17 are being amended. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Section 112

Claims 1, 13, and 16 were rejected under the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The claims have been amended to address each of the grounds for rejection.

Section 101

Claims 1-12 were rejected on as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The applicant has not amended the claims in response to this rejection, as the issue of whether the recited signals are statutory subject matter is presently before the Federal Circuit in an appeal from a decision of the Board of Patent Appeals & Interferences in its appeal no. 2003-0853.

Section 103

Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 18 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,453,356 B1 ("Sheard") in further view of 4GuysFrom Rolla.com, published March 3, 2003, pages 1-5 ("Leech").

Each of the independent claims recites that the data entered by the user and received from the browser is in a transfer format, that this transfer format is different from the process format, that the application, which ultimately receives the data, processes the data in the process format and therefore in not the transfer format, and that the error checking occurs in the process format and therefore not in the transfer format.

This feature is not taught or disclosed by Leech, which operates entirely in the transfer format, i.e., the format in which the user enters the data. This feature would not arise from a

DEC 19 2006

Applicant : Reiner Hammerich et al.
Serial No. : 10/760,135
Filed : January 16, 2004
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-193001 / 2001P00021 WOUS

combination of Sheard and Leeche, because Sheard has no apparent mechanism for getting corrected input from a source after the converted input (i.e., the data in the process format) is found to be erroneous. The motivation provided by the examiner would let the user know immediately that something is wrong if it is detected in the transfer format of the data, but would not apply if the error were detected in the process format, as recited in the claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the claims are allowable over Sheard and Leeche, alone or in combination with any of the other references relied on by the examiner.

Drawings

The applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate that the drawings were filed on May 5, 2004, are acceptable.

Conclusion


For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 17 Aug 06


Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50354453.doc